



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,154	09/27/2000	Masahiko Sato	450100-02733	6619
20999	7590	04/15/2009	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			RAMAN, USHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2424	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/15/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-10, filed January 21, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 and 6-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn (US Pat. 5,945,987) in view of Ludtke (US Pat. 6,460,032) and Wheeler (US Pre Grant Pub. 2001/0056478) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Specifically, US Pat. 6,460,032 to Ludtke is disqualified as 103 prior art to the present application under the provisions of 35 USC 103(c). Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of WO 99/46922 to Ludtke. Newly cited reference, WO 99/46922 to Ludtke, published on Sept. 16, 1999, over a year before applicant's U.S. filing date of September 27, 2000 accordingly qualifies only as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:  

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2424

3. Claims 1-4, and 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn (US Pat. 5,945,987) in view of Ludtke (WO 99/46922) and Wheeler (US Pre Grant Pub. 2001/0056478).

In regards to claims 1 and 9, Dunn discloses a broadcast program retrieval system for retrieving a desired broadcast program among a plurality of broadcast programs, comprising:

A data server (22) including a database (44) configured to receive and store broadcast program information (i.e. program records, see column 2, lines 54-62), the program information including name of an entertainer (see column 5, lines 59-63), and at least one function for searching the broadcast program information, which includes at least one program retrieval identification code (program ID) and other information related to broadcast programs (see column 3, lines 19-33).

The program ID uniquely identifies a program data record corresponding to a program content, wherein the program data records comprise data including scheduled time of the program. The program ID is therefore a function of content and a time slot. See column 5, lines 59-63.

A user server configured to receive (see column 3, lines 28-30) and store the broadcast program information (column 6, lines 18-25 and column 9, lines 30-35), said user server operating to send to the data server at least one content keyword for searching the broadcast program information for the desired broadcast program (see column 7, lines 20-25), including searching according to the name of an entertainer (see column 9, lines 1-2) and receiving a select number of program data

Art Unit: 2424

records including program ID, the select number of program data records relating to the content keyword as a result of the searching by the data server. See column 3, lines 16-20 and lines 28-30.

Wherein data server enables said user server to retrieve a select number of broadcast program information stored in the user server (see column 8, lines 43-49), and allows a user to review the select number of broadcast program information (see column 10, lines 35-40, and lines 65-66) and to select the desired broadcast program from among a select number of broadcast programs corresponding reviewed select number of broadcast program information (see column 12, lines 64-67 and column 13, lines 1-3). Dunn also discloses that the broadcast programs maybe broadcast over various types of network, including a satellite network. See column 2, lines 36-44.

Dunn's headend server receives user query and searches its data server to find programs matching user's query, i.e. the search for information pertaining to a desired program is performed by the server. Dunn fails to disclose that the broadcast program information stored on the data server and user server are identical and that the user server is operative to receive from the data server only a select number of program retrieval identification codes related to a query result; wherein the select number of program retrieval identification codes received from the data server enables the user to retrieve the broadcast program information.

Ludtke discloses a method of querying wherein the search results consist only of identifiers for the data that are transmitted in response to a search (see page 24,

Art Unit: 2424

lines 7-15), wherein Ludtke discloses that the method of transmitting search results comprising only identifiers (p. 24, lines 9-10) “substantially reduces the amount of data that is transmitted over the network bus” (p. 24, lines 14-15). Ludtke further discloses that the search results (i.e. identifiers) are related to search criteria.

In a further analogous art, Wheeler additionally discloses a method of receiving identifiers such that the identifiers are used to retrieving data that is already available at a user server. In particular Wheeler discloses the steps of storing information identical to the data server at the user server in a storage medium (e.g. CD ROM), wherein a user submits a query to the server and the server in turn processes the request by transmitting an identifier corresponding to the desired result, rather than transmitting data files. See Wheeler: [0012], [0014], [0028], [0033]. Wheeler therefore discloses a method of using received data identifiers to retrieve information from the user’s server.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art apply the teachings of Ludtke and Wheeler’s teachings to the system of Dunn by modifying the server to transmit only data retrieval codes pertaining to the user query, and using the data retrieval codes to retrieve data that is already available locally at the user server, thereby reducing retrieval time and transmission bandwidth.

In regards to claim 2, the user server in the modified system is connected to the head end through a communication link (cable network). Note figure 1 in Dunn.

In regards to claim 3, the modified system comprises search criteria including element of the content forming the broadcast program, such as category, title, actor, etc. Note column 7, lines 20-25 in Dunn.

In regards to claim 4, the modified system uniquely identifies each of the broadcast programs by a program ID in the program data record. Therefore the broadcast program inherently has a program ID appended in an "event information region" in order to properly identify the program specified by a program ID. Note column 2, lines 56-59 in Dunn.

In regards to claim 6, the program information sent of by the head end to the user server is used by a plurality of applications running on the set top box including an electronic program guide. Note column 4, lines 1-5 in Dunn.

In regards to claims 8 and 11, the data server of the modified system comprises a "keyword" database where a plurality of keywords related to a program (such as categories, title, actor, etc.) are used to match at least one content keyword (search criteria) received from the user server. Note column 8, lines 55-67 and column 9, lines 1-7 in Dunn.

In regards to claim 7 and 10, the modified system does not disclose that the program ID is unique for each of the plurality of broadcasts of the same program. Official notice is taken that program data event in an EPG are uniquely identified by the channel and time (as seen on an EPG grid). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system in order to identify each of the program records by a combination of its channel and

Art Unit: 2424

time information, thereby allowing each airing of a program event to be uniquely identified, according to its channel and airtime time.

In regards to claim 12, the modified system lacks that the program retrieval system updates the keyword database with any changes made to other information related to the broadcast programs. Official notice is taken that it is well known for head ends often receive schedule update information from a plurality of satellite feeds (downlink feed) and/or other master head end sources. Therefore changes in the information related to a program are reflected in updated program information records received from such master head ends. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system with a master head end for providing information reflecting any changes in the broadcast program information, in order to ensure that the local head ends have the most up to date broadcast program information.

In regards to claim 13, the program information record in the modified system includes other information related to the broadcast programs such as cast members (list of performers) appearing on each of the broadcast programs in addition to program ID. Note column 5, lines 56-67 in Dunn.

In regards to claim 14, the searching functions provided in the modified system has the capability for a viewer to select items from the "viewer list" that contain the programs that have been added by the user and therefore reflecting the user's preference. Note column 10, lines 32-36 and column 9, lines 55-63 of Dunn.



**Conclusion**

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to USHA RAMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher Kelley/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2424

/Usha Raman/